

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

IVAN GABRIEL ISLAS,
Plaintiff,

v.

BANK OF AMERICA,
Defendant.

Case No. 2:24-CV-00493-JHC

ORDER

Before the Court are Defendant's motion to dismiss, Dkt. # 35, and pro se Plaintiff's motion for judgment, Dkt. # 37, motion for miscellaneous relief, Dkt. # 39, and motion to expedite, Dkt. # 42.

LCR 7(b)(2) provides, "Except for motions for summary judgment, if a party fails to file papers in opposition to a motion, such failure may be considered by the court as an admission that the motion has merit." Plaintiff has not filed an opposition to Defendant's motion to dismiss. Granted, Plaintiff has submitted some materials since the filing of the motion, Dkt. ## 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, and 43, but they do not indicate that the motion lacks merit. Moreover, they include outlandish statements. For example, a letter to the Court states,

I would like to add the FU to my BOA lawsuit for disclosing my personal info and secrets and likeness . . . to . . . use funds to commit voyeurism . . . having google and Facebook join and keep info from me, allowing people to commit voyeurism[.] [T]o make my life a game of discriminating against me to further distress me and induce my suicidal thoughts and profit with my damages paying people to damage my reputation & to fuck girls I like.

ORDER OF DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE - 1

1 Dkt. # 40. Another filing states,

2 I can tell there's foul play at work[.] [T]hey also keep paying people to [harass]
3 me and threaten me or my safety[.] [T]hey keep paying people to steal my stuff
4 from little things to cell phones and drive me psychotic[,], taking fund from me[,]
having people [paid] for sharing voyeurism of me.

5 Dkt. # 37. Given the foregoing, the Court exercises its discretion under LCR 7(b)(2) to consider
6 the lack of an opposition as an admission that Defendant's motion to dismiss has merit.

7 Furthermore, for the reason stated therein, the motion indeed appears to have merit. The
8 amended complaint does not appear to state a claim upon which relief can be granted; and the
9 claims appear time-barred. *See* Dkt. # 35.

10 Thus, the Court GRANTS the motion at Dkt. # 35 and DISMISSES this matter with
11 prejudice. The Court STRIKES as moot the motions at Dkt. ## 37, 39, and 42.

12 DATED this 21st day of March, 2025.

13
14 
15 _____
16 JOHN H. CHUN
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26